



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS Washington, D.C. 20231 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO	
09/453,800	12/03/1999	ANDREW WATSON	CIT101125 3066		
759	90 01/23/2002				
GEORGE T MARCOU			EXAMINER		
KILPATRICK STOCKTON LLP			AKERS, GEOFFREY R		
SUITE 800	TH CTDEET NOW		Millio, OL	OTTRET R	
700 THIRTEENTH STREET NW WASHINGTON, DC 20005			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
			2164		
			DATE MAILED: 01/23/2002		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		•
		74·G
Applicant(s)	een	
	Group Art Unit でんり	
eneath the co	orrespondence ac	idress
MONTH(S)	FROM THE MAIL	ING DATE
, may a reply be	timely filed after SIX	(6) MONTHS
the mailing date	days will be considere e of this communication NED (35 U.S.C. § 13	on .
	the merits is clos	
	vithdrawn from cor	
is/are a	allowed.	,
is/are r	ejected.	
is/are o	bjected to.	
are sub require	pject to restriction of ment.	or election
⊒ disapproved	i .	
d). ve been		
ule 1 7.2(a)).		

	Application No.	Applicant(s)	Applicant(s)		
Office Action Summany	09/453800	Wat	Water		
Office Action Summary	Examiner		Group Art Unit		
	Alex.	5	2164		
-The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ears on the cover she	et beneath the co	orrespondence add	ress	
Period for Reply	っ				
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET OF THIS COMMUNICATION.	TO EXPIRE	MONTH(S	FROM THE MAILIN	NG DATE	
 Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFF from the mailing date of this communication. If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a If NO period for reply is specified above, such period shall, by defau Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by start 	reply within the statutory rult, expire SIX (6) MONTHS	ninimum of thirty (30) 5 from the mailing date	days will be considered e of this communication	timely.	
Status /	1 100				
Responsive to communication(s) filed on	/3/17			•	
☐ This action is FINAL .	, , ,				
 Since this application is in condition for allowance excepaceordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 19 			the merits is close	d in	
Disposition of Claims					
□ Claim(s)		is/are p	pending in the applic	ation.	
Of the above claim(s)					
□ Claim(s)	is/are a	is/are allowed.			
□ Claim(s)		is/are r	ejected.		
□ Claim(s)					
□ Claim(s)			-	election	
Application Papers		require			
☐ See the attached Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Draw	ina Review. PTO-948.				
☐ The proposed drawing correction, filed on	-	ed 🗆 disapprove	d.		
☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are objection					
☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.					
The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.					
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119 (a)-(d)					
 □ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority □ All □ Some* □ None of the CERTIFIED copies of received. 	of the priority document	ts have been			
☐ received in Application No. (Series Code/Serial Num	her)		·		
 □ received in Application No. (Series Code/Serial Num □ received in this national stage application from the In 					
·	nternational Bureau (PC	CT Rule 1 7.2(a)).	·		
□ received in this national stage application from the In *Certified copies not received:	nternational Bureau (PC	CT Rule 1 7.2(a)).	<u> </u>		
☐ received in this national stage application from the In *Certified copies not received: Attachment(s)	nternational Bureau (PC	CT Rule 1 7.2(a)).			
□ received in this national stage application from the In *Certified copies not received:	No(s).	CT Rule 1 7.2(a)). □ Interview Sumr		n, PTO-15	

Art Unit: 2164

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-21 have been examined.

Oath/Declaration

2. The oath or declaration is defective. A new oath or declaration in compliance with 37 CFR 1.67(a) identifying this application by application number and filing date is required. See MPEP §§ 602.01 and 602.02.

The oath or declaration is defective because the inventor did not sign the statement.

Correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless --

- (e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371(c) of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.
- 4. Claims 1-7, 18-19 are rejected under 35 USC 102(e) as anticipated by DeFrancesco(US Pat. No: 5,878,403).
- 5. As per claims 1 and 18 DeFrancesco teaches a method of offering account based services comprising providing a baseline offer for a first account based service(Abstract) and receiving a first preference indicator signal(Fig 1B/152/150/149/148) adjusting the baseline offer so as to form a first modified offer based upon the first preference indicator signal(Fig 1B/153) and

Art Unit: 2164

adjusting the first account based service so as to form a second account based service based upon the first preference indicator signal(Fig 2A/227/224) and providing the first modified offer for the second account based service(Fig 2A)(col 10 line 32-col 11 line 56)(col 14 lines 4-14).

- 6. As per claims 2 and 19 DeFrancesco teaches the method of claim 1 further comprising:receiving a second preference indicator signal(Fig 1B/153) and adjusting the first modified offer so as to form a second modified offer based upon the second preference indicator signal(Fig 1C/170) and adjusting the second account based service-so as to form a third account based service based upon the second preference indicator signal and providing the second modified offer for the third account based service(Fig 2B/234B/238/236/237).
- 7. As per claim 3 DeFrancesco teaches the method of claim 1 further comprising providing a list of available preference indicator choices along with providing the baseline offer(col 22 lines 39-41)(col 23 lines 48-50)(col 24 lines 1-5).

See Shire of the

- 8. As per claim 4 DeFrancesco teaches the method of claim 1 further comprising providing a list of available preference indicator choices along with providing the first modified offer(col 24 lines 1-5)(Fig 1B/154).
- 9. As per claim 5 DeFrancesco teaches the method of claim 3 further comprising selecting the list of available preference indicator choices from a universe of possible preference indicators(col 24 lines 40-45).

Art Unit: 2164

The state of the state of the state of

10. As per claim 6 DeFrancesco teaches the method of claim 3 further comprising receiving personal information and determining a qualification based on the personal information(col 20 lines 46-51).

As per claim 7 DeFrancesco teaches the method of claim 6 further comprising using the qualification to select the list of available preference indicator choices from the universe of all possible preference indicator choices(col 10 lines 41-44).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 12. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness efficient 3 for the symmetric action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

ed no the pyrene and was

- 13. Claims 11-12 are rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as unpatentable over DeFrancesco(US Pat. No:5,878,403) and further in view of Keen(US Pat. No: 5,774,882).
- As per claim 11 Keen teaches the method of claim 1 wherein the first and second account based services relate to a credit card account (Abstract) (col 3 lines 1-col 4 line 16). It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of the invention to combine DeFrancesco in view of Keen to teach the above. The motivation to combine is to teach a method of issuing credit cards with integrity as enunciated by Keen(col 2 lines 6-11).
- 15. As per claim 12 Keen teaches the method of claim 1 wherein the first and second account based services relate to a credit card account(col 3 line 1-col 4 line 16). It would have been

٠,,,

Application/Control Number: 09/453,800

Page 5

Art Unit: 2164

obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of the invention to combine DeFrancesco in view of Keen to teach the above and further to apply these methods to insurance applications. The motivation to combine is to teach a method of issuing accounts with integrity as enunciated by Keen(col 2 lines 6-11).

16. Claims 10, 14-17 are rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as unpatentable over Defrancesco(US Pat. No: 5,878,403) and further in view of Buchanan(US Pat. No: 5,950,179).

- As per claim 10 Buchanan teaches the method of claim 6 wherein the qualification is a credit line(Abstract)(col 1 lines 5-8). It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of the invention to combine DeFrancesco in view of Buchanan to teach the above. The motivation to combine is to teach a method of issuing a type of credit card as enunciated by Buchanan(col 1 lines 5-8).
- 18. As per claim 14 Buchanan teaches a computer system comprising a first eamputer wherein the first computer comprises a firewall module for determining security parameters; an applicant module for collecting data(Fig 2/44/40) and a checker module for determining worthiness parameters(Fig 2/92) and account services building module for receiving preference indicator signals indicative of features associated with an account based service(Fig 2/84). It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of the invention to combine DeFrancesco in view of Buchanan to teach the above. The motivation to combine is to teach a method of issuing accounts with integrity as enunciated by Buchanan(col 1 lines 5-8).

Art Unit: 2164

19. As per claim 15 DeFrancesco teaches the computer system of claim 14 further comprising a network coupled to the first computer(Fig 1A/112a/113a/130/133a/133b/133c104/102/103).

- 20. As per claim 16 DeFrancesco teaches the computer system of claim 15 further comprising a second computer coupled to the network(Fig 1A/112b113b124a/122a/123a).
- 21. As per claim 17 DeFrancesco teaches the computer system of claim 15 wherein the network includes the World Wide Web(col 17 line 64-col 18 line 3).

- 22. Claim 13 is rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as unpatentable over DeFrancesco(US Pat. No: 5,878,403).
- 23. As per claim 13 DeFrancesco teaches the method of claim 1 wherein the first and second account based services relate to a general credit application(Abstract). It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of the invention to apply these techniques to a telecommunications account. The motivation for this is to utilize these efficient techniques to telephone credit cards.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

24. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

25. Claims 8-9 and 20-21 are rejected under 35 USC 112(2nd) for failure to state by the applicant in specific detail what the invention is.

Art Unit: 2164

Conclusion

26. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

-Walker teaches a system for performing online credit reviews and approvals

Any questions concerning this communication should be addressed to the examiner of record, Dr. Geoffrey Akers, P.E., who can be reached between 6:30 AM and 5:00 PM Monday through Friday at 703-306-5844. If attempts to contact the examiner are unsuccessful, the examiner's superior, Mr. Vincent Millin, SPE, may be telephoned at (703)-308-1065.

The fax number for Formal or Official faxes and Draft or Informal faxes to Technology Center 2100 or this Art Unit is (703)-308-6296 or 6306. Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703)-305-3900.

GRA

January 1/8,2002